

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 21 APR 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050195

International filing date (day/month/year)
17.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
20.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F3/14, G09G5/14

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Wolff, L

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7049



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050195

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050195

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-15
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-15
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-15
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Referring to point V:

- 1 Reference is made to the following document:
D1 : WO 03/083717 A (BRITISH TELECOMMUNICATIONS PUBLIC LIMITED
COMPANY; BUCKLEY, PAUL, KENN) 9 October 2003 (2003-10-09)
- 2 Clarity
Claims 1 to 3, and claims 12 to 13 are unclear and they do not meet the requirements
of Article 6 PCT for the following reasons:
 - 2.1 Claims 1 and 12 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT in that the matter for
which protection is sought is not clearly defined. The claims attempt to define the
subject-matter in terms of the result to be achieved, that means enabling operation of
display devices without using at least a server system to coordinate and manage the
distribution of images across the multiple display devices, which merely amounts to a
statement of the underlying problem, without providing the technical features
necessary for achieving this result.
 - 2.2 Moreover, Although claims 1 and 12 have been drafted as separate independent
claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from
each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection
is sought. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not
meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
 - 2.3 The expressions "capabilities" and "functionality" recited in the claims 2 to 3 and 13
are vague and unclear and leave the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the
technical features to which they refer, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-
matter of said claims unclear, Article 6 PCT.
- 3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the

subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a system which comprises a plurality of devices (page 1 line 3), wherein each of said plurality of devices is configured to enable screen sharing from one of said devices to the other of said devices (page 1, lines 27 to 30, and page 9 line 6 to 7); and a screen connect function resident on at least one of said plurality of devices (page 4 lines 9 to 15 and page 5 line 27 to page 6 line 7), wherein activation of said screen connect function initiates said screen sharing between the plurality of devices (page 4 lines 16 to 20, illustrated with the figure 1).

4 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 12

What has been said above with reference to system claim 1 concerns device claim 12 mutatis mutandis, as device claim 12 contains only technical features relating to the obvious purpose of the system claim 1, and, as the same prior art as above mentioned is relevant.

5 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-11, 13-15

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-15 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

5.1 D1 further discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that said screen sharing includes at least one of sharing display capabilities and functionality from one of said plurality of devices to an other of said plurality of devices (page 7 line 13 to 16 and line 23 to 25).

The subject-matter of claims 2, 13 and 14 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

5.2 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that the display capabilities of said one of said plurality of devices is more limited than the display capabilities of said other of said plurality of devices (page 8 lines 6 to line 12). The subject-matter of claim 3 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

- 5.3 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that the processing capabilities of one of said plurality of devices is more limited than the processing capabilities of said other of said plurality of devices (page 8 lines 6 to line 12).
The subject-matter of claim 4 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.4 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that one of said plurality of devices is a cellular telephone (page 3 line 30).
The subject-matter of claim 5 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.5 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that one of said plurality of devices is a personal digital assistant device (page 1 line 27 to line 29).
The subject-matter of claim 6 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.6 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that a display of said one of said plurality of devices is transferred to a display of said other of said plurality of devices (page 3 line 13 to line 31).
The subject-matter of claim 7 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.7 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that said display of said one of said plurality of devices is transferred as at least one of an HTML, XML, or HAVi-DDI screen description (page 4 line 32 to page 33 line 4). The subject-matter of claim 8 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.8 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that a portion of a user interface of said one of said plurality of devices is transferred to said other of said plurality of devices to operate as a portion of the user interface of said one of said plurality of devices (page 3 line 13 to line 31). The subject-matter of claims 9 and 15 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.9 D1 also discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that said screen connect function is enabled when each of said plurality of devices is in close proximity to each other of said plurality of devices (page 3 lines 26 and 27). The

subject-matter of claim 10 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT...

- 5.10 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that close proximity between each of said plurality of devices enables a screen connect icon on one of said plurality of devices to enable activation of said screen connect function (page 3 lines 26 and 27 and page 8 lines 25 to 28). The subject-matter of claim 11 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

10586704

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 21 APR 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050195

International filing date (day/month/year)
17.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
20.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F3/14, G09G5/14

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Wolff, L

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7049



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050195

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2005/050195

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-15
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-15
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-15
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Referring to point V:

- 1 Reference is made to the following document:
D1 : WO 03/083717 A (BRITISH TELECOMMUNICATIONS PUBLIC LIMITED
COMPANY; BUCKLEY, PAUL, KENN) 9 October 2003 (2003-10-09)
- 2 Clarity
Claims 1 to 3, and claims 12 to 13 are unclear and they do not meet the requirements
of Article 6 PCT for the following reasons:
 - 2.1 Claims 1 and 12 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT in that the matter for
which protection is sought is not clearly defined. The claims attempt to define the
subject-matter in terms of the result to be achieved, that means enabling operation of
display devices without using at least a server system to coordinate and manage the
distribution of images across the multiple display devices, which merely amounts to a
statement of the underlying problem, without providing the technical features
necessary for achieving this result.
 - 2.2 Moreover, Although claims 1 and 12 have been drafted as separate independent
claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from
each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection
is sought. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not
meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
 - 2.3 The expressions "capabilities" and "functionality" recited in the claims 2 to 3 and 13
are vague and unclear and leave the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the
technical features to which they refer, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-
matter of said claims unclear, Article 6 PCT.
- 3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the

subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a system which comprises a plurality of devices (page 1 line 3), wherein each of said plurality of devices is configured to enable screen sharing from one of said devices to the other of said devices (page 1, lines 27 to 30, and page 9 line 6 to 7); and a screen connect function resident on at least one of said plurality of devices (page 4 lines 9 to 15 and page 5 line 27 to page 6 line 7), wherein activation of said screen connect function initiates said screen sharing between the plurality of devices (page 4 lines 16 to 20, illustrated with the figure 1).

4 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 12

What has been said above with reference to system claim 1 concerns device claim 12 mutatis mutandis, as device claim 12 contains only technical features relating to the obvious purpose of the system claim 1, and, as the same prior art as above mentioned is relevant.

5 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-11, 13-15

Dependent claims 2-11, 13-15 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

- 5.1 D1 further discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that said screen sharing includes at least one of sharing display capabilities and functionality from one of said plurality of devices to an other of said plurality of devices (page 7 line 13 to 16 and line 23 to 25).
The subject-matter of claims 2, 13 and 14 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.2 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that the display capabilities of said one of said plurality of devices is more limited than the display capabilities of said other of said plurality of devices (page 8 lines 6 to line 12).
The subject-matter of claim 3 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

- 5.3 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that the processing capabilities of one of said plurality of devices is more limited than the processing capabilities of said other of said plurality of devices (page 8 lines 6 to line 12).
The subject-matter of claim 4 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.4 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that one of said plurality of devices is a cellular telephone (page 3 line 30).
The subject-matter of claim 5 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.5 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that one of said plurality of devices is a personal digital assistant device (page 1 line 27 to line 29).
The subject-matter of claim 6 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.6 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that a display of said one of said plurality of devices is transferred to a display of said other of said plurality of devices (page 3 line 13 to line 31).
The subject-matter of claim 7 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.7 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that said display of said one of said plurality of devices is transferred as at least one of an HTML, XML, or HAVi-DDI screen description (page 4 line 32 to page 33 line 4). The subject-matter of claim 8 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.8 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that a portion of a user interface of said one of said plurality of devices is transferred to said other of said plurality of devices to operate as a portion of the user interface of said one of said plurality of devices (page 3 line 13 to line 31). The subject-matter of claims 9 and 15 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
- 5.9 D1 also discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that said screen connect function is enabled when each of said plurality of devices is in close proximity to each other of said plurality of devices (page 3 lines 26 and 27). The

subject-matter of claim 10 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

- 5.10 Then, D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) that close proximity between each of said plurality of devices enables a screen connect icon on one of said plurality of devices to enable activation of said screen connect function (page 3 lines 26 and 27 and page 8 lines 25 to 28). The subject-matter of claim 11 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.